

**Harpswell Planning Board Meeting  
Minutes of April 21, 2004**

**Approved 05-19-04  
Page 1 of 9**

**Attendance:** *Present:* Sam Alexander – Chairman, Howard Nannen, Dee Carrier, John Papacosma – Vice Chairman, and James Carignan – Associate. Noel Musson – Town Planner and Amy E. Ferrell – Planning Assistant were also in attendance. *Absent:* Joanne Rogers and Henry Korsiak - Associate.

**Introductions and Pledge of Allegiance** - the meeting had been advertised in the Times Record and recorded. Chairman Alexander called the meeting to order at 6:30 pm, introduced above Board members and staff, and led the pledge of allegiance.

Chairman Alexander asked for a moment of silence in the memory of Don Rogers, former Planning Board Member who recently passed away.

Chairman Alexander appointed Associate Member James Carignan as a voting member in the absence of Joanne Rogers.

**Review of Agenda and Procedure** - Chairman Alexander reviewed general Board procedures and the agenda for the evening.

**Approval of Minutes** - The Board reviewed the minutes of 3/17/04. **Motion – To approve the minutes of March 17, 2004, as submitted. (Motion by Alexander and seconded by James Carignan; carried 5-0)**

**Site Visits Review** - Chairman Alexander reported that on Monday, April 19, Joanne Rogers, Dee Carrier, Howard Nannen, John Papacosma, and Town Planner Noel Musson visited the property of Harpswell Heritage Land Trust and G & G Partnership, Bruce Davis, and Larry Doughty. Dee Carrier, Howard Nannen, John Papacosma, and Town Planner Noel Musson visited the Town property at Trufant-Summerton Ball-Field.

**Amendment of the Agenda – Motion – To amend the agenda to allow the Town of Harpswell, Recreation Director to present the Town’s proposal first. (Motion by Carrier and seconded by Alexander; carried 5-0)**

**04-04-04      Town of Harpswell (Recreation), Site Plan Review; Renovation and Expansion of Existing Concession Stand at Trufant-Summerton Ball-Field, Interior, Tax Map 46-4, Harpswell Islands Road, Great Island, Harpswell.**

Applicant Presentation – Liz Bouve, Recreation Director, reviewed the Town’s proposal to expand an existing 12’ x 24’ concession stand to 22’ x 24’. Last fall the existing concession stand sustained significant damage due to a water pipe break in the ceiling making repairs to the stand necessary. The Recreation Director stated that with an expansion, it would allow a window to be relocated, improving the concession stand and making it more user friendly to the volunteers working inside and the patrons.

Member Dee Carrier excused herself as a voting member for this application because she is a member of the Recreation Committee.

Board Review and Discussion – Chairman Alexander stated the Board will be reviewing Section 15 of the Site Plan Review Ordinance and the dimensional standards of the Basic Land Use Ordinance.

**15.1. Dimensional Requirements**

The Board discussed the fact that the concession stand is already in existence, that there are no setback issues, and all dimensional requirements are met. *Motion – The Board finds the proposal meets the standards of section 11.3 of the Basic Land Use Ordinance. (Motion by Alexander and seconded by Nannen;*

carried 4-0)

*Motion – The Board finds the proposal meets the standards of section 15.1 of the Site Plan Review Ordinance. (Motion by Alexander and seconded by Nannen; carried 4-0)*

### **15.2. Utilization of the Site**

*Motion – The Board finds the application meets the requirements of Utilization of the Site. (Motion by Carignan and seconded by Alexander; carried 4-0)*

### **15.3. Adequacy of Road System**

Chairman Alexander stated the site is located off Route 24. *Motion – The Board finds the proposal meets the standards of section 15.3, Adequacy of Road Systems. (Motion by Nannen and seconded by Alexander; carried 4-0)*

### **15.4. Access into the Site**

Chairman Alexander stated the proposal would not change access into the site. *Motion – The Board finds the proposal meets the standards of section 15.4, Access into the Site. (Motion by Carignan and seconded by Alexander; carried 4-0)*

### **15.5. Access/Egress Way Location and Spacing**

*Motion – The Board finds that since there will be no change to the access of the site, it finds the proposal meets the standards of section 15.5. (Motion by Carignan and seconded by Nannen; carried 4-0)*

### **15.6. Internal Vehicular Circulation**

*Motion – The proposal will not change the internal vehicular circulation on the site. (Motion by Nannen and seconded by Alexander; carried 4-0)*

### **15.7. Parking**

Chairman Alexander asked if any parking spaces will be lost with the expansion. Liz Bouve stated there will be no loss of parking only an adjustment to location. Noel Musson stated that part of this proposal is to add posts around the parking lot which will enhance the safety of the ball field. Nannen stated that at the Site Visit the Board could see there was adequate space for vehicle circulation. *Motion – The Board finds the proposal meets the standards under section 15.7, Parking. (Motion by Nannen and seconded by Carignan; carried 4-0)*

### **15.8. Pedestrian Circulation**

Chairman Alexander stated he could see no change by this proposal. *Motion - The Board finds the proposal meets the standards section 15.8. (Motion by Alexander and seconded by Carignan; carried 4-0)*

### **15.9. Stormwater Management**

*Motion – The Board finds there will be no change in stormwater management with the proposal and that it meets the standards of section 15.9. (Motion by Carignan and seconded by Nannen; carried 4-0)*

### **15.10. Erosion Control**

Chairman Alexander asked the applicant what type of foundation will be used. Ms. Bouve explained that concrete construction tubes, the same type of foundation used at the existing structure. Chairman Alexander also asked if the area where the expansion is being proposed is level. Ms. Bouve indicated the area is relatively level, when it rains the whole thing is on a slope and runs down, but the depths of the holes will not be different than that which already exists. *Motion – The application meets the requirements of section 15.10. (Motion by Alexander and seconded by Papacosma; carried 4-0)*

### **15.11. Water Supply and Groundwater Protection**

Papacosma stated this would have no impact on either water supply or groundwater protection. *Motion – The Board finds the application meets the requirements of section 15.11. (Motion by Alexander and seconded by Carignan; carried 4-0)*

### **15.12. Subsurface Waste Disposal**

Chairman Alexander stated there is an existing system in place and does not require a new system for this expansion. *Motion – The Board finds the proposal meets the standards of section 15.12. (Motion by Alexander and seconded by Carignan; carried 4-0)*

#### **15.13. Utilities and Essential Services**

Chairman Alexander clarified with the applicant that existing services will be used. *Motion – The Board finds that since there will be no change in service, the proposal meets the standards of section 15.13. (Motion by Carignan and seconded by Nannen; carried 4-0)*

#### **15.14. Natural Features and Buffering**

Chairman Alexander stated there would be no change with this proposal. *Motion – The Board finds the application meets the requirements of section 15.14. (Motion by Alexander and seconded by Nannen; carried 4-0)*

#### **15.15. Lighting**

*Motion – The Board finds that since there is no lighting proposed the applicant meets the requirements of this section. (Motion by Carignan and seconded by Alexander; carried 4-0)*

#### **15.16. Water Quality Protection**

Chairman Alexander stated there would be no change with this proposal. *Motion – The application meets the requirements of section 15.16. (Motion by Alexander and seconded by Carignan; carried 4-0)*

#### **15.17. Hazardous, Special, and Radioactive Materials**

*Motion – The Board finds the proposal meets the standards of section 15.17. (Motion by Papacosma and seconded by Nannen; carried 4-0)*

#### **15.18. Solid, Special, and Hazardous Waste Disposal**

*Motion – The proposal meets the standards of section 15.18 because no changes are being proposed. (Motion by Carignan and seconded by Nannen; carried 4-0)*

#### **15.19. Historic and Archaeological Resources**

Chairman Alexander stated this was not a historical building or an archaeological site. *Motion – The Board finds the application meets the requirements of section 15.19. (Motion by Alexander and seconded by Nannen; carried 4-0)*

#### **15.20. Floodplain Management**

Chairman Alexander stated the proposed location is not in the Flood Zone. *Motion – The Board finds the application meets the requirements of section 15.20. (Motion by Alexander and seconded by Nannen; carried 4-0)*

#### **15.21. Technical and Financial Capacity**

Chairman Alexander stated that labor will be donated. Liz Bouve explained the ball field is supported entirely with the revenue of the signs. Materials have also been donated. *Motion – The Board finds the application meets the requirements of section 15.21. (Motion by Alexander and seconded by Carignan; carried 4-0)*

**Motion – The Board finds the application meets the requirements of the Basic Land Use Ordinance and the Site Plan Review Ordinance. (Motion by Alexander and seconded by Carignan; carried 4-0)**

---

**04-04-01 Larry Doughty, Reconstruction of Non-Conforming Structure; Replace Existing Metal Shed with Wood Shed (10' x 12'); Commercial Fisheries 1, Tax Map 38-142, Long Point Road, Great Island, Harpswell.**

Applicant Presentation – Larry Doughty explained that there is a deteriorating metal shed that was put on the property approximately 30 years ago. He applied for a permit to have it rebuilt and was denied

because the structure is non-conforming. Mr. Doughty, based on a potential long term need of a septic system, hired DW Newburg to give him an idea of the best location for a septic system before trying to relocate the shed. Mr. Doughty is proposing to replace the metal shed with a wooden shed moving it 10' further from the abutting property and 8' feet further from the back cove. The property is used as a seasonal camp, the main building will remain the same, and storage is a necessity.

Board Review and Discussion – Carrier noted that the submitted plans indicate a crib/retaining wall to be placed on site. Mr. Doughty stated it was to be a part of the shed and would like to have a place to park a car. He indicated that no large trees will be cut down, maybe some smaller poplar trees. The Board discussed the dimensions of the property, the 75' setback from the high water mark from each side of the property, and the setback from the traveled way. Papacosma proposed moving the shed across the right-of-way to the field next to the cottage. Musson explained that Section 10.3.2.2 states that “In no case, shall a structure be reconstructed or replaced so as to increase its non-conformity.” It was discussed that by moving the structure to eliminate a non-conformity on one side of the property, a new non-conformity would be created.

Public Comment – Mr. Howard Reiche, direct abutter to the Doughty property, expressed that he and his wife are in favor of this proposal. He would feel very strongly against moving the proposed shed to the other side of the right-of-way in the field, as that would be in their direct view of the water.

**Motion – The Board finds the application for the shed meets the requirements of Section 10.3.2.2 of the Shoreland Zoning Ordinance regarding compliance to the setbacks to the greatest practical extent. Motion by Alexander and seconded by Carignan;** Before the vote, Carrier asked for further explanation regarding the proposed fill and crib work/retaining wall to create a parking space. Mr. Doughty indicated that he intends to bring in some fill and that the angle to the crib work will be adjusted to miss the large tree next to the Reiche property. Alexander stated he didn't recall the Shoreland Zoning Ordinance addressing fill or retaining walls. Musson also stated an option would be to approve the shed in the location it is proposed and then ask the Codes Office to make an interpretation on how the Shoreland Zoning Ordinance applies to the retaining wall as a structure and determine whether or not the applicant would need to come back before the Board. Musson also stated the tree cutting issue will need to be addressed with the Codes Office. Papacosma noted that should the applicant need to put in the new septic system, there would be substantial disturbance to the area. Carrier stated she was ready to proceed as long as the Codes Office will address the retaining wall. **Carried 5-0.**

Board Review and Discussion - Chairman Alexander reviewed the standards of Section 13.4.7 of the Basic Land Use Ordinance.

**Motion – The Board finds the applicant meets section 13.4.7.1 and will maintain safe and healthful conditions. (Motion by Carignan and seconded by Carrier; carried 5-0)**

**Motion – The Board finds the applicant meets section 13.4.7.2 and will not result in water pollution, erosion, or sedimentation to surface waters with the use of silt fencing during the disturbance of soils.** Alexander stated he would have problems with this Section if the retaining wall and fill were a part of the Board's decision. Mr. Doughty stated some grading will take place. Alexander recommended silt fencing be used. **(Motion by Alexander and seconded by Papacosma; carried 5-0)**

**Motion – The Board finds the applicant meets section 13.4.7.3.** Alexander verified with the applicant that there will be no plumbing or wastewater. **(Motion by Alexander and seconded by Nannen; carried 5-0)**

**Motion – The Board finds the applicant meets section 13.4.7.4 with the provision that good management control measures are used for erosion and stormwater runoff, the proposal will not have an adverse impact on spawning grounds, fish, aquatic life, bird or other wildlife habitat. (Motion by Nannen and seconded by Carrier; carried 5-0)**

**Motion – The Board finds the applicant meets section 13.4.7.5 and will conserve shore cover and points of access to inland and coastal waters with limiting the amount of trees removed from the site and using vegetative ground cover in the location of the existing shed once removed.** Papacosma stated the applicant stated he would minimize the amount of small trees being cut down and leave the mature trees in place. Nannen recommended the applicant use forms of native ground cover to prevent future erosion from the location of the site of the removed shed. **(Motion by Papacosma and seconded by Carrier; carried 5-0)**

**Motion – The Board finds the applicant meets section 13.4.7.6 and will protect archaeological and historic resources.** Alexander noted this site was not listed as an archaeological site. **(Motion by Alexander and seconded by Carignan; carried 5-0)**

**Motion – The Board finds the applicant meets section 13.4.7.7 and will not adversely affect existing commercial fishing or maritime activities.** **(Motion by Alexander and seconded by Carrier; carried 5-0)**

**Motion – The Board finds the applicant meets section 13.4.7.8 with the condition that a flood zone permit is obtained through the Codes Office.** **(Motion by Alexander and seconded by Papacosma; carried 5-0)** Nannen suggested that the proposed shed be lifted off the ground and be put on stilts. Musson noted that when the Codes Office issues its permit, they will recommend construction measures.

Alexander reviewed the requirements of Section 15 in the Shoreland Zoning Ordinance.

**Motion – The Board finds the applicant meets section 13.4.7.9 and is in conformance with Section 15 of the Shoreland Zoning Ordinance with consideration to determining the movement of the shed meets the greatest practical extent standards.** **(Motion by Nannen and seconded by Carrier; carried 5-0)**

---

**04-04-02      Bruce Davis (Homes & Harbors Real Estate), Site Plan Review; Convert Existing Residential Structure to Non-Residential use – Office Space (900 sq ft), Art Gallery (400 sq ft), and Ice Cream Business (250 sq ft); Shoreland Residential, Tax Map 32-54, Harpswell Islands Road, Orr’s Island, Harpswell.**

Applicant Presentation – Bruce Davis is proposing a retail, food service, and office space building called “Harborplace”. Mr. Davis purchased the property in September of 2003 as a 6.18 acre lot. Two waterfront acres have been separated leaving 4.18 acres toward the road for this proposal. Mr. Davis stated that apart from the proposal before the Board, it is his desire to put a cottage on the same lot at a future point. The proposed use for “Harborplace” is a Real Estate office on the first floor, which will be the primary business consisting of approximately 900 sq ft.; a Photo/Art Gallery also on the first floor at the North end of the building including the enclosed porch which will be used as a display area and approximately 400 sq ft.; an Ice Cream/Bakery on the South end in the rustic ell approximately 250 sq. ft. Upstairs there will be two additional office spaces for local business owners that may wish to lease office space. The proposal also includes two private bathrooms for employees, no public restrooms are proposed.

Mr. Davis reviewed with the Board the changes he made to his proposed parking plan since his initial proposal. The septic plan has been revised from a 5 bedroom home design to a business design for the proposed uses. Mr. Davis explained to the Board that he has a separate septic proposal for the cottage.

Board Review and Discussion – Alexander clarified the lot size with Mr. Davis as being 4.18 acres for the proposed business. Nannen stated that the changes in the parking layout were an improvement from what the Board saw at the Site Visit. Mr. Davis clarified to the Board that the impervious surfaces in his proposal included the surface coverage for the proposed cottage in the future. Alexander stated he has reviewed all the dimensional requirements in the Basic Land Use Ordinance and Section 15 of the Site Plan

Review Ordinance.

### **15.1. Dimensional Requirements**

*Motion – The Board finds the proposal meets the dimensional requirements of both the Basic Land Use Ordinance and the Site Plan Review Ordinance. (Motion by Alexander and seconded by Carignan; carried 5-0)*

### **15.2. Utilization of the Site**

Alexander reviewed that the site is in the interior zone and is an allowed use. Nannen stated that the application also meets the requirements to minimize the removal of natural vegetation, preserve natural drainage, and minimize impervious services. Nannen asked Mr. Davis if he intends on paving the parking area. Mr. Davis stated he did not intend to pave, however, if he decided to, he would like that to be apart of this application process as not to have to meet the Board again. He intends to lay a reclaim and hopes that will work. *Motion – The Board finds the proposal meets the requirements of Utilization of the Site. (Motion by Nannen and seconded by Carignan; carried 5-0)*

### **15.3. Adequacy of Road System**

Alexander stated the site is located off Route 24 on Orr's Island. *Motion – The Board finds the proposal meets and standard of section 15.3, Adequacy of Road Systems. (Motion by Alexander and seconded by Carrier; carried 5-0)*

### **15.4. Access into the Site**

The Site Plan has been amended to eliminate one access point leaving only one. Mr. Davis stated his proposal was for 19 parking spaces. Musson stated he came up with a minimum of 17 spaces by breaking down the required one space for every 250 sq ft. of Office Space, one space for every 180 sq ft of retail space, one per three seats and one employee at an eating and drinking establishment. Musson noted there was no seating being proposed, however, there will be picnic tables located outside. The Board determined that 17-19 spaces would be adequate. Mr. Davis is also proposing 10' instead of the required 9' between stalls. *Motion - The Board finds the proposal meets the requirements of section 15.4, Access into the Site; section 15.5, Access/Egress; and 15.6, Internal Vehicular Circulation based on the revised plan being submitted to the Planning Board office indicating a single curb cut from Route 24, the width of the Access/Egress from Route 24, paved parking area, and the internal vehicular circulation as described in the proposed plan showing location for circulation for delivery traffic, customer traffic, and employee traffic and that the proposal meets the requirements of section 15.7, Parking, based on the sizes of the various uses and the standards within the Ordinance for those uses and further approve that the applicant will build a minimum of 17 parking spaces with the approval to expand up to 19 parking spaces. (Motion by Nannen and seconded by Carignan; Carrier expressed her concern that should the parking lot be paved it would take away from the esthetics of the building and the originality and naturalness of the area; **carried 5-0 after public comment**)*

**Public Comment** – Arthur Dyer, resident of Orr's Island off the Bangs Shore Road, expressed his concern about the number of commercial businesses proposed for the building and wanted to know if the Town can restrict the number of businesses in what was once a residential home. Alexander responded the Board needed to act on the application as presented, if the applicant wants to increase the businesses, expand current businesses, or change a business, the applicant would need to go back before the Board for those or any changes. Nannen stated that if any proposed business meets the standards of the Site Plan Review Ordinance, then conceivably any type of commercial business could be placed in the interior zone.

### **15.5. Access/Egress Way Location and Spacing**

*See above Motion*

### **15.6. Internal Vehicular Circulation**

*See above Motion*

### **15.7. Parking**

*See above Motion*

### **15.8. Pedestrian Circulation**

Alexander clarified with the applicant that walk ways and paths were going to be placed on the front side of the building. *Motion - The Board finds the proposal meets the standards section 15.8. (Motion by Alexander and seconded by Carignan; carried 5-0)*

### **15.9. Stormwater Management**

Mr. Davis indicated the parking area is level, six trees will need to be removed to put the parking lot in. Nannen noted the site slopes slightly to the south. *Motion – The Board finds the proposal meets the requirements of Stormwater Management. (Motion by Nannen and seconded by Carrier; carried 5-0)*

### **15.10. Erosion Control**

*Motion – The finds the proposal is consistent section 15.10. (Motion by Carignan and seconded by Papacosma; carried 5-0)*

### **15.11. Water Supply and Groundwater Protection**

Mr. Davis indicated he intends to use the existing well unless it proves to be inadequate. *Motion – The Board finds the applicant meets the requirements of section 15.11. (Motion by Carrier and seconded by Alexander; carried 5-0)*

### **15.12. Subsurface Waste Disposal**

Alexander noted the Codes Office will ensure the current system is adequate or if a replacement system is needed. *Motion – The Board finds the applicant meets the standards of section 15.12, with approval from the Codes Office. (Motion by Alexander and seconded by Carignan; carried 5-0)*

### **15.13. Utilities and Essential Services**

Mr. Davis noted all electrical has been upgraded. *Motion – The Board finds the applicant meets the standards of section 15.13. (Motion by Alexander and seconded by Nannen; carried 5-0)*

### **15.14. Natural Features and Buffering**

*Motion – The Board finds the applicant has been sensitive to this issue and meets the requirements of section 15.14. (Motion by Carignan and seconded by Papacosma; carried 5-0)*

### **15.15. Lighting**

Mr. Davis stated that the lighting on the structure will be indicative to what you would see on a residence with the exception of a lit granite sign and an antique goose neck light on the south end of the ell. There will also be a lamp post in the parking area. Nannen recommended the parking area/walk ways can be outlined with solar powered lights. *Motion – The Board finds the applicant meets the requirements of section 15.15. (Motion by Nannen and seconded by Alexander; carried 5-0)*

### **15.16. Water Quality Protection**

*Motion – The applicant meets the requirements of section 15.16 with no adverse impact. (Motion by Carignan and seconded by Nannen; carried 5-0)*

### **15.17. Hazardous, Special, and Radioactive Materials**

*Motion – The Board finds the proposal meets the standards of section 15.17. (Motion by Carignan and seconded by Carrier; carried 5-0)*

### **15.18. Solid, Special, and Hazardous Waste Disposal**

Mr. Davis stated there will be a dumpster on site to be emptied weekly for the office space and the gallery. The ice cream/bakery will be required to remove waste daily. Dumpsters will be screened. *Motion – The proposal meets the standards of section 15.18. (Motion by Nannen and seconded by Carignan; carried 5-0)*

#### **15.19. Historic and Archaeological Resources**

Musson stated he wasn't aware of this building being on the national registry or identified in the Comprehensive Plan. *Motion – The Board finds the application meets the requirements of section 15.19. (Motion by Alexander and seconded by Carrier; carried 5-0)*

#### **15.20. Floodplain Management**

Chairman Alexander stated the proposed location is not in the Flood Zone. *Motion – The Board finds the application meets the requirements of section 15.20. (Motion by Alexander and seconded by Carrier; carried 5-0)*

#### **15.21. Technical and Financial Capacity**

Mr. Davis has hired a contractor and has the capacity to carry out the proposed project. *Motion – The Board finds the applicant meets the requirements of section 15.21. (Motion by Alexander and seconded by Nannen; carried 5-0)*

**Motion – The Board finds the applicant meets the requirements of the Harpswell Land Use Ordinances and recognizes there is a future proposal to build a driveway and a dwelling on the same parcel. (Motion by Alexander and seconded by Carignan; carried 5-0)**

**The Board signed and dated the submitted site plan to be recorded and a copy returned back to the Planning Office.**

---

#### **04-04-03 Harpswell Heritage Land Trust (Rebecca Stanley), Preliminary Discussion; Parking Lot (approx. 6 cars) and Kiosk for Skolfield Shores Preserve; Shoreland Residential, Tax Map 1-4, Skolfield Place, Harpswell.**

Applicant Presentation – Rebecca Stanley, Chair of the Stewardship Committee for the Harpswell Heritage Land Trust, introduced herself and Reed Coles who will be assisting in the presentation. The Land Trust purchased 19 acres of shorefront property from the Skolfield Farm in 2002. A major goal of the Trust is to provide low impact public access to the shore. In order to accomplish this goal, the Trust needs a small parking area and informational kiosk that would have trail maps and the rules for the trails. The name of this property is the Skolfield Shores Preserve. This parcel does not have road frontage off Route 123 and can only be accessed through a 50' right-of-way over land owned by G & G Partnership. The Trust approached David Gleason of G & G Partnership and received permission to locate a parking lot within the rights-of-way on his land off Route 123. The Trust believes there are several advantages to having the parking lot located right off Route 123, and one is to make the public aware of the trail. The Trust is proposing the trail to be open from dawn to dusk. In order for the parking lot to be located in that area, the Trust will need to seek a variance from the Board of Appeals from the property line setback. Ms. Stanley stated they were before the Board to see if they have any question for the Trust.

Board Review and Discussion – Alexander asked if the 12' right-of-way parallel to the 50' right-of-way is separate from the existing driveway. Ms. Stanley stated it was and it was also given by Mr. Gleason. Alexander expressed his thought of reconfiguring the two right-of-ways to allow the parking lot to be set at 45 degree angle. Mr. Coles indicated the Trust approached Mr. Gleason with different configurations for the parking and Mr. Gleason is set on the proposed location.

Musson asked the Board to discuss any items that might pose a red flag using the Site Plan Review Ordinance. Nannen asked if the Trust is proposing lighting; Ms. Stanley stated there would be no lighting, the trail would be closed at dusk and only open for use after dawn. Nannen also asked about any proposed landscaping. Ms. Stanley stated that they will be putting in vegetative screening, a mix of trees and shrubs. Nannen recommended that the Site Plan reflect and landscaping that is being proposed. Ms. Stanley showed the Board where the proposed kiosk will be located which is currently not reflected on the plans. Musson stated that the Town has a Sign Ordinance that will have to be complied with.



Ms. Stanley stated the proposed parking lot will have six spaces and will not be paved. Nannen asked if bicycles or ATV's will be allowed on the trail. Ms. Stanley stated they would not, only foot traffic.

Nannen suggested the Trust consider having some parking available for cyclists. He also mentioned that the small business located next door could use the parking as overflow parking. Ms. Stanley stated they would use signage and communicate with the operator to avoid such problems. Musson stated that should that business proposal come before the Board parking would need to be taken under consideration.

Ms. Stanley suggested that they move the parking 10' further from the road. The Board agreed it would make for a better proposal. Alexander asked how the Trust will contain parking if more than six cars show up and try to park off the road. Alexander suggested rocks or curbing. Mr. Coles indicated it would be a good option if the problem arises as well as using shrubs. The Board agreed the Trust is presenting a good idea. Ms. Stanley stated they are hoping to get the trail system under way in July.

Papacosma asked if the site had any archeological significance. Ms. Stanley state the Trust had the State Archeologist do a site visit and they found a pre-form of an old weapon head, but nothing else was found. There is a deep ravine on the property and the Trust received a permit by rule by the DEP to locate a bridge there.

Nannen suggested that the architectural style for the kiosk could be related historically to the character of the farm sitting up on the hill. Ms. Stanley stated an eager volunteer has already cut the timbers for the proposed kiosk.

Public Comment – A citizen asked if the seafood stand was a permitted business. They noted it appeared out of nowhere one day and was attending this meeting, because they thought the business being taken up by the Board could be dealing with this issue. Musson noted this was an issue to be addressed through the Codes Office.

**Planners Updates-** Mr. Musson informed the Board of a Public Hearing on May 10<sup>th</sup>. Drafts of all the proposed ordinance changes will be mailed to the Board members. A Planning Board workshop will need to be held prior to the Public Hearing and will be coordinated and set at a later date. Tentatively Thursday, April 29<sup>th</sup>, at 4:00 pm works well for most Board members.

Musson discussed the May Site Visit and the Board agreed to begin having them at 4:00 in the afternoons through the summer. Date set for May Site Visit is Tuesday, May 18<sup>th</sup>, 4:00 pm.

Musson announced that Howard Nannen's last Planning Board meeting is tonight and thanked him for all his work.

**Adjournment - Motion to adjourn at 9:15 pm. (Motion by Chairman Alexander and seconded by Nannen; carried 5-0)**

Respectfully submitted,

Amy E. Ferrell  
Planning Assistant